

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/678,043	10/01/2003	John W. McIntosh	McIntoshProgrammerator	6636
27119 7590 03/25/2010 ALBERT W. WATKINS 30844 NE 1ST AVENUE			EXAMINER	
			HEFFINGTON, JOHN M	
ST. JOSEPH, MN 56374			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2179	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/25/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/678,043	MCINTOSH ET AL.			
Examiner-initiated interview Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	JOHN HEFFINGTON	2179			
All Participants: Status of Application:					
(1) <u>JOHN HEFFINGTON</u> . (3)					
(2) <u>Al Watkins(31676)</u> .	(4)				
Date of Interview: 22 March 2010	Time: <u>1:00 pm</u>				
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applic  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes If Yes, provide a brief description:	ant's representative)				
Part I.					
Rejection(s) discussed: 35 USC 102(b) anticipated by Tuttle,35 USC 103(a) Tuttle in vie	w of Perholtz				
Claims 8, 14, 16 and 28					
Prior art documents discussed: Tuttle, Perholtz					
Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENE See Continuation Sheet	RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	S DISCUSSED:			
Part III.					
/SARA ENGLAND/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2179	Applicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)			
,	**				

Application No.

Applicant(s)

Application No. 10/678,043

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner and the applicant discussed previously submitted preliminary amendments to the claims. The examiner reviewed the amendments and the pior art of recored as well as other prior art. In the independent claims, the examiner suggested that the applicant use "indeterminate location" rather than "any location". The examiner also concurred that no reference need be made to "finding" or "not finding" a graphical element in the pixel image, that it was enough to reference the "results of said searching".